

VARIA

Closing Doors and Opening Gates: Professor Ruggles Gates, “Race Crossing” Research, and the Strange Survival of Scientific Racism in Post-war Australia

Robert Brown

Independent researcher

robert.brown955@gmail.com

Abstract: In 1958, botanist-biologist Professor Reginald Gates conducted biometric and anthropometric “race crossing” studies on populations spanning Australia and Papua New Guinea. Gates is largely remembered as an anachronistic conservative whose opposition to interracial marriage and belief in race theory ostracised him from the post-war Anglo-American scientific mainstream. Paradoxically, the article aims to investigate the more positive responses that Gates, funded by segregationist American benefactors, received from Australian anthropologists interested in aiding his research. It argues Gates’ activity throughout the Global South, and the methodological overlap and collaboration he experienced with Australian anthropologists, further complicates and decentres North Atlantic facing understandings of the decline of racial thinking after 1945. Gates resurrected the legacy of the abortive Harvard-Adelaide “race-crossing” study (1938-39), in order to manufacture a tranche of data that would help serve his scientific insurgency against the UNESCO statements on racial equality (1950). Leaning on reminiscences of Harvard-Adelaide anthropologists Joseph Birdsell and Norman Tindale, Gates determined that by re-treading their footsteps, he could buttress his thesis that “races” were segregated by nature. The article demonstrates that using Australian fieldwork, he advanced his regressive political agenda that population groups, in the United States and elsewhere, should be segregated by political design. As an associate editor of the scientific racist *Mankind Quarterly* journal, Gates bypassed mainstream channels to disseminate his miscegenation research.

Keywords: Reginald Gates; scientific racism; *Mankind Quarterly*; Australia, anthropology

© 2025 Robert Brown.

This is an open access article licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Introduction

On 20 August 1958, delegates assembled in Adelaide for the inaugural day of the 33rd Congress of the Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science. Among the Congress speakers were three of Australia's foremost authorities regarding questions of demography, "indigenous affairs," and immigration. Perhaps the most famous was Professor W. D. Borrie from the Research School of Social Science in Canberra. Borrie addressed the question of post-war Australian immigration policy. He was joined as a guest speaker by J. B. Cleland, anthropologist from the University of Adelaide.¹ Cleland had been a vocal supporter of the controversial policy of "biological absorption" of Australia's Aboriginal population through forced intermarriage with Europeans. Delivering his own paper, "The Future of the Australian Aborigine" was C. E. Bartlett, who held the position of Protector of Aborigines for South Australia. Bartlett's post as Protector gave him sweeping powers to oversee the Aboriginal populations of Adelaide and its vast hinterland.²

The conference papers of these three men dovetailed with three strands of race science and racially coded policymaking through which faltering attempts had been made to build a racial state in 1900s Australia. The White Australia Policy (1901) created at the birth of the nation a bio-political constitution of immigration restrictions borrowed from other "white men's countries" designed to keep Asian and other "non-white" settlers out of Australia.³ While politicians billed the policy as a necessary cordon sanitaire against infection and invasion from populous Asia, Australian biochemists looked to fortify vulnerable European bodies against tropical disease and desert heat, while calibrating schemes of limited European immigration to solve population shortages. In the 1930s, race scientists radically reframed their attitude towards Australia's Aboriginal population. Anthropologists from the University of Adelaide reconfigured Australian Aboriginals from a "doomed race" into "dark Caucasian" cousins of Europeans, fit for interbreeding with the European settler population. This biomedical obsession had horrific consequences, informing the damaging policies of "Aboriginal protection" officials who oversaw forced intermarriage and removal of Aboriginal children from their families well into the 1970s. Paradoxically by the late

¹ Programme, Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science, 33rd Congress, Adelaide, 10–27 August 1958, Box 4/12, Reginald Ruggles Gates Papers, Liddell Hart Centre for Military Archives, King's College London (hereafter cited as Gates MSS).

² Unless otherwise noted, all archival material cited is from the Reginald Ruggles Gates Papers, Liddell Hart Centre for Military Archives, King's College London (Gates MSS). For example: Programme, Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science, 33rd Congress, Adelaide, 10–27 August 1958, Box 4/12 (Gates MSS).

³ Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Melbourne: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008), 6. See also, Emma Kowal *Haunting Biology: Science and Indigeneity in Australia* (Duke University Press, Durham, 2023).

1940s, belief among Australian race scientists that fixed racial taxonomies could define the diverse “reproductive frontiers” of the outback was collapsing. Despite this, those scientists who spent their careers constructing the theoretical foundations of White Australia did not make quite the same enthusiastic effort to dismantle it all after the anti-Nazi war of 1945. The UNESCO statements on race (1951) had theoretically, “elevated the social over the biological in defining ethnicity.”⁴ However in reality such pronouncements were often met with apathy and deflection from scientists trying to move on. And so, in 1958, from laboratories to lecture halls, some of these legacies still lingered.

That summer the Adelaide Congress also hosted an unlikely scientific pilgrim from the Northern Hemisphere, a Nova Scotian, former King’s College London botanist and pro-segregation anthropologist, Professor Reginald ‘Ruggles’ Gates. What is interesting about this encounter was how Gates was received so enthusiastically not only by conference secretary A.D Packer, but also by a large number of these Australian anthropologists, intellectuals and officials. This seems unusual because Gates’ reputation as a serious scientist had already been ruined by this point in Anglo-American academia.⁵ Convinced that Jewish conspiracies actively prevented him from gaining publication in mainstream journals, his career hit a nadir in 1947 when he was expelled from his post as a visiting professor at Howard University for biometrically measuring his African-American students while teaching them his own syllabus about black inferiority.⁶

His scientific methodology, “racial genetics,” which focused on measuring human racial type and inheritance based solely on observable physical features, was regarded as anachronistic by 1954. The rise of genetics in the 1950s was largely killing off the credibility of biometrics as a fruitful way to measure human inheritance.⁷ Even worse, he used physical anthropology to come to politically dangerous conclusions about racial segregation. Arguing that the superior “whites” shouldn’t intermarry with the inferior “blacks”, such views were regarded as toxic and dangerous in Anglo-American discourses wracked by recrimination in the wake of the anti-Nazi war. Despite Gates obvious self-image as a sober, objective scientist unfairly victimised by dishonest, politically motivated anti-racists, long-time scientific friends such as

⁴ Ross L. Jones, “Eugenics, the 1950s and Beyond,” in *Dhoombak Goobgoowana: A History of Indigenous Australia and the University of Melbourne – Volume 1: Truth*, ed. Ross L. Jones, James Waghorne, and Marcia Langton, 181-201 (Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne University Press, 2024), 188.

⁵ Gavin Schaffer, “‘Scientific’ Racism Again?”: Reginald Gates, the Mankind Quarterly and the Question of “Race” in Science after the Second World War,” *Journal of American Studies* 41, no. 2 (2007), 253-278.

⁶ Schaffer, “Scientific Racism Again?,” 254.

⁷ Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia* (New York: Basic 2003), 226.

British anthropologist, HJ Fleure and Harvard scientist Ernest Hooton implored Gates to abandon this methodological dead end.⁸

However, in the run up to the ANZAAS Conference he persisted. Financed by American benefactors and advised on the ground by co-operative Australian anthropologists, Gates embarked on anthropometric “race crossing” investigations of populations surrounding Alice Springs, Darwin and Port Moresby in Papua New Guinea. By winter 1959, he was proudly presenting his Australian “genetical” research at the Royal Anthropological Institute in London and the Chandra Bose Institute Endowment Lecture.⁹ The findings also took pride of place in the inaugural 1960 issue of the scientific racist journal, *Mankind Quarterly*. As an associate editor, Gates sat alongside some of the most notorious neo-Nazis and scientific racists of the post-war world.¹⁰

Reginald Gates, Race Science, and the Global South

In particular, Gates felt he was finishing the work of Harvard anthropologist and former Hooton protégé, Joseph B. Birdsell, and Norman Tindale of the South Australian Museum. Gates corresponded closely with both. In 1938-39, backed by the Carnegie Institute, Birdsell and entomologist Tindale conducted a similar population investigation to Gates, the Harvard-Adelaide Race Crossing Study of Queensland, South Australia and the Northern Territory. As he and Tindale began to disagree about the usefulness of anthropometrics as a tool for measuring interracial inheritance, Birdsell after a hiatus abandoned the project. However, Gates, drawing on the reminiscences of both, was convinced his use of anthropometry worked in identifying “segregate physical features within hybrid subgroups.” By continuing to prove his thesis that “races” were segregated by nature in Australia even after generations of intermarriage, he felt he could advance his political agenda that population groups should continue to be segregated in the United States and elsewhere by political design.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 226.

⁹ Ruggles Gates, “Genetical Studies of the Australian Aborigines,” lecture given to the Royal Anthropological Institute, London, 8 October, 1959, K/PP65/9/3, Reginald Ruggles Gates Papers, Liddell Hart Centre for Military Archives, King’s College London (hereafter cited as Gates MSS). A similar paper was delivered on 2 November, 1959 at the Chandra Bose Institute Endowment Lecture.

¹⁰ R. Ruggles Gates, “The Emergence of Racial Genetics,” *Mankind Quarterly* 1, no. 1 (1960): 11-14. See also R. Ruggles Gates, “The Genetics of the Australian Aborigines,” *Acta Genet. Med. Gemell.* 9 (1960): 7-50; *idem*, “Racial Elements in the Aborigines of Queensland, Australia,” *Z- Morph. Anthropol.* 50 (1960): 150-166; *idem*, “Studies in Race Crossing. IX. Crosses of Australians and Papuans with Caucasians, Chinese, and Other Races,” *Acta Genet. Med. Gemell.* 9 (1960): 165-184; *idem*, “The Australian Aborigines in a New Setting,” *Man* 60 (1960): 53-56.

The article argues that Gates saw the Harvard-Adelaide study not as a failure, as Birdsell did, but a rich seam of data and expertise in physical anthropology that he could mine. Gates was not the only post-1945 scientific outcast using Australian field research to contribute to the agenda of the scientific racist *Mankind Quarterly*. Although there is no record of their direct correspondence, Australian psychologist Stanley Porteus was also an editorial advisor for the journal. Porteus conducted psychometric “race crossing” research on populations around Alice Springs around in 1962, also coming to deeply regressive views about the links between intelligence, race and miscegenation.¹¹ Porteus had been born in Melbourne, but operated from the University of Hawaii. Like Gates, Porteus had been heavily discredited in the inter-war years, in his case for the work *Temperament and Race* (1926), which linked race with intelligence, and similarly he showed a deep intellectual stubbornness in the face of criticism, never deviating from his outdated research all the way into the 1970s.

The article expands the scope of previous stories told about Reginald Gates’ post-war activities, and further fleshes out histories of the relationship between scientific racism and the resurgent far-right after 1945. Gates along with Porteus was a member of the IAAEE (International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics) and then became an associate editor of the *Mankind Quarterly* journal (1961), both of whom were funded by the Pioneer Fund, brainchild of racist Massachusetts cotton baron, “Colonel” Wycliffe Draper. Draper’s mission through covertly patronizing these groups was to lobby to maintain racial segregation in the United States, and disseminate racist ideology into academic and political discourse.¹² Over the years Gates had befriended, advised and received money from Draper.

He also co-operated very closely with two other IAAEE members and Pioneer Fund beneficiaries, Scottish anthropologist Robert Gayre, and American psychologist and pro-segregation expert witness in *Brown v Board of Education*, Professor Henry Garrett. As Gavin Schaffer has investigated, the birth of the *Mankind Quarterly* arose from disgruntled correspondence between Gayre and Gates, both bemoaning the marginalization of race science, and their desire to strike back.¹³ With the help of Garrett, whose close relationship

¹¹ David E. Stannard, “Honoring Racism: The Professional Life and Reputation of Stanley D. Porteus,” *Social Process in Hawai’i* 39 (1999), 89. See also Ross L. Jones, “Eugenics, the 1950s and Beyond,” in *Dhoombak Goobgoowana: A History of Indigenous Australia and the University of Melbourne – Volume 1: Truth*, ed. Ross L. Jones, James Waghorne, and Marcia Langton, 285-309 (Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne University Press, 2024), 295.

¹² William Tucker, *The Funding of Scientific Racism: Wycliffe Draper and the Pioneer Fund* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002), 92.

¹³ Schaffer, “Scientific Racism Again?,” 274.

with Draper meant he could secure plenty of funding, under the editorship of Gayre the *Mankind Quarterly* became a haven for fringe academics fighting against “anti-racist theory.”¹⁴

Together, Gates and the acolytes of the Pioneer Fund built a more enduring network of far right entryism that continues to seep into the western academic and political mainstream even in the 2020s. A shape-shifting cabal of far-right anthropologists, psychologists and other fringe researchers, are still pushing narratives linking “race” to IQ, tying this to inequalities in economic, education and health outcomes. “Evolutionary Psychologist” Richard Lynn is perhaps the best-known veteran of this insurgency. Lynn, founder and president of the Ulster Institute for Social Research which promotes his thesis that “non-white” immigration to Western nations has lowered the overall population IQ, is also current editor-in-chief of the *Mankind Quarterly*.

Gates has largely only been written about by historians for his association with those who founded the *Mankind Quarterly*. The study of his post-1945 career outside these relationships is still ripe for exploration. Gates’ field research and networking activity in Australia and elsewhere in the global south formed a huge part of his contribution to a racist campaign that was more transatlantic facing. Analyses that tell a more decentred story of the influences behind Gate’s thought and contributions to Draper’s movement are therefore needed.

The article begins by mapping the existing discourse on studies of the history of race science and the far-right, and where Gates Australian sojourn fits into this. It then looks to trace where Gates got the money from to facilitate his trip to Australia. Finally, it looks not only at the network of contacts Gates built in Australia and the United States, but the way in which he went about his field research and disseminated his output through the *Mankind Quarterly*.

Historiography of Reginald Gates and the Retreat of Scientific Racism

As Warwick Anderson pointed out, throughout most of the twentieth century, “race science mattered-but just how it mattered depended on where one was.”¹⁵ In the 1980s, this history of race science was assumed by historians such as Elazar Barkan and Nancy Stepan to mean the decline and fall of scientific racism in North Atlantic intellectual circles.¹⁶ Daniel Kevles’ *In the Name of Eugenics* (1986), while crucial in charting the past and future political

¹⁴ Ibid., 275.

¹⁵ Warwick Anderson, “Racial Conceptions in the Global South,” *Isis* 105, no. 4 (2014): 782-792.

¹⁶ Elazar Barkan, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism: Changing Concepts of Race in Britain and the United States Between the Two World Wars* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992); Nancy Stepan, *The Idea of Race in Science: Great Britain, 1800–1960* (London: Macmillan, 1982)

implications of eugenic and genetic manipulation, is grounded in transatlantic transactions between eugenicists.¹⁷ This body of work focused on Anglo-American anthropological traditions of hard, “fixed racial types,” “racial” segregation, and the legacy of “white supremacy” and the anti-Nazi war. For several decades Barkan’s and Stepan’s works were, “often received as global accounts of racial thought” especially when it came to academic trends in the 1930s and 1940s.¹⁸ In their view scientific racism largely fell away after 1945.

Pascal Germann argued such assumptions fell into “teleological traps” that failed to represent the uncertainty, instability and potential retrenchment in the immediate post-1945 political and scientific environment.¹⁹ As Schaffer and Tucker proved, Gates and his fellows at the *Mankind Quarterly* fed a body of racist research that sought to scientifically justify the Jim Crow laws in the United States and apartheid in South Africa.²⁰ However, Schaffer and Tucker’s work still largely operated within the bubble of Gates’ dealings in Canada, Britain and the United States.

Jaehwan Hyun has explored some of Gates’ positive correspondence and collaboration with Professor Suda Akiyoshi and other University of Tokyo anthropologists.²¹ He argues that they eagerly used his negative ideas about “miscegenation,” along with fellow scientific outcast Carlton Coon’s fixed typologies in *Races* (1950), to help further develop “konketsuji” anthropology. “Konketsuji” anthropology, a negative term for the Japanese children of American servicemen stationed in Japan, was an anti-miscegenation movement using anthropometric measurement of “hybrid children” to reinforce nationalist claims that intermarriage was a pollutant of Japan’s homogenous bloodline.

Suda used Gates work to promote scientific racism at home in Japanese language research. At the same time, Suda and others were desperate for Japan gain credibility with the progressive international scientific community by offering softer pronouncements in English language research, and sought this by contributing to the International Biological Program (IBP, 1964–1974). The Human Adaptability section of the IBP (HA-IBP) was the first truly global effort to study and collate research on “human variation.” Such a heterogeneous

¹⁷ Daniel J. Kevles, *In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995), preface, x.

¹⁸ Warwick Anderson, “Racial Conceptions in the Global South,” 782-792.

¹⁹ Pascal Germann, “Race in Post-War Science: The Swiss Case in a Global Context,” *History of the Human Sciences* 34, no. 3 (2021): 1–26, on 3.

²⁰ Gavin Schaffer, *Racial Science and British Society, 1930–62* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008); William H. Tucker, *The Funding of Scientific Racism: Wickliffe Draper and the Pioneer Fund* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002); Tony Kushner, “H. J. Fleure: A Paradigm for Inter-War Race Thinking in Britain,” *Patterns of Prejudice* 42, no. 2 (2008): 151–66.

²¹ Jaehwan Hyun, “In the Name of Human Adaptation: Japanese American ‘Hybrid Children’ and Racial Anthropology in Postwar Japan,” *Perspectives on Science* 30, no. 1 (2022): 167–93.

array of research methods and international researchers forced the program leaders to be more relaxed on the “reality of race concepts” in order to get scientists to collaborate rather than squabble.²² Suda exploited these looser spaces in the burgeoning grey area of “human population studies,” and got some his Gatesian work published in an international workshop “Human Adaptability and Its Methodology” sponsored by the HA-IBP in 1966.²³ Suda’s protégés were even able to push more *konketsuji* projects under the guise of HA-IBP “physical growth studies.”²⁴ In this way the ghost of Gatesian race theory survived outside transatlantic spaces long after his death in 1961.

Many other studies have responded to the insularity of Barkan and Stepan by expanding their scope to chart trans-hemispheric connections between far flung research institutions.²⁵ Pascal Germann has charted how Swiss research centres, not traditionally seen as bastions of imperialist racial thinking had, “global interconnections with racial researchers around the world.”²⁶ Although marginal nations such as Switzerland had no history of colonialism, “the impact of post-war anti-racism on science was more limited than is frequently assumed: it did not drain the market for race knowledge” in a Europe that still, “clung to imperialism and was still shaped by racist violence.”²⁷ Germann also points to other historians charting trans-hemispheric racial research projects that flew under the previous historiographical radar.²⁸ The idea that scientific racism survived after 1945 in various corners of the academic and activist world is therefore not a new or original assumption.

To elucidate the more specific significance of Gates’ racial research in the antipodes and the global south, Warwick Anderson offers us a different way to understand his post-war career. Anderson’s central thesis is that the history of racial science in what he terms the “Global South” was dominated by very different assumptions to the northern hemisphere, with, “greater interest in racial plasticity, environmental adaption, “mixing” and miscegenation, and blurring racial boundaries; endorsement of biological absorption.”²⁹ The relationships

²² Ibid., 169; see also Jennifer Robertson, “Eugenics in Japan: Sanguinous Repair,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Eugenics*, ed. Alison Bashford and Philippa Levine, 430-448 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 432.

²³ Hyun, “In the Name of Human Adaptation,” 171.

²⁴ Hyun, “In the Name of Human Adaptation,” 171.

²⁵ Francesco Cassata, *Building the New Man: Eugenics, Racial Science and Genetics in Twentieth-Century Italy* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2011); Sebastián Gil-Riaño, “Relocating Anti-Racist Science: The 1950 UNESCO Statement on Race and Economic Development in the Global South,” *British Journal for the History of Science* 51, no. 2 (2018): 1–23.

²⁶ Germann, “Race in Post-War Science,” 3.

²⁷ Ibid., 3.

²⁸ Elise K. Burton, *Genetic Crossroads: The Middle East and the Science of Human Heredity* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2021).

²⁹ Warwick Anderson, “Racial Conceptions in the Global South,” 782–92.

between racial and political thought in Australia were also diverse. As Walker has argued, nationalist anxieties about “white purity”, “Asian” invasion, and “yellow peril,” competed with eugenic and medical movements that examined the climatic and reproductive fitness of Europeans living in the tropics. The place of native Australians and Torres Strait Islanders within White Australia were intellectual as well as political battlegrounds.

As Kane Collins, Alison Bashford and Carolyn Strange have explored, public intellectuals such as University of Sydney Professor Griffith Taylor were conducting “race crossing” studies in the 1920s, and openly arguing that intermarriage between East Asians and Europeans would be positive for the “racial fitness” of the nation.³⁰ “Mixed race” people, “might be disparaged as degenerate, validated as forming stable communities, absorbed into “white” populations, or counted as indigenous.”³¹ In such a diverse intellectual and political climate, Gates could shed his Northern hemisphere pariah status, operate more freely and collect new field data unmolested.

There has been some investigation of Northern-Southern hemisphere scientific transaction on which we can build. Studies have already demonstrated how investigations into unravelling the ancestry of “hybrid” populations in the Pacific islands, proved to be a revelation to North American racial “savants” when they voyaged below the equator.³²

Tamson Pietsch in *Empire Scholars* (2013) also teased out the fluidity of trans-imperial and trans-hemispheric scientific intellectual co-operation, highlighting along with Alison Bashford and Carolyn Strange, links between the University of Sydney, Chicago and Harvard among other Atlantic-Pacific partnerships.³³ But where did Gates, as someone shunned by many mainstream American universities, fit into this process? In order to

³⁰ Carolyn Strange and Alison Bashford, *Griffith Taylor: Visionary, Environmentalist, Explorer* (Canberra: National Library of Australia, 2008); Kane Collins, “Imagining the Golden Race,” in *Australia’s Asia: From ‘Yellow Peril’ to Asian Century*, ed. David Walker and Agnieszka Sobocinska, 99-120 (Crawley, WA: UWA Publishing, 2012).

³¹ Collins, “Imagining the Golden Race,” 100.

³² Warwick Anderson, “Racial Conceptions in the Global South,” 788; Warwick Anderson, “Racial Anthropology and Human Biology in the Island Laboratories of the United States,” *Current Anthropology* 53 (2012): 95–107; Warwick Anderson, “Hybridity, Race, and Science: The Voyage of the *Zaca*, 1934–1935,” *Isis* 103 (2012): 229–53; Bronwen Douglas and Chris Ballard, eds., *Foreign Bodies: Oceania and the Science of Race, 1750–1940* (Canberra: Australian National University Press, 2008); Kate Fullagar, ed., *The Atlantic World in the Antipodes: Effects and Transformations since the Eighteenth Century* (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2012).

³³ Strange and Bashford, *Griffith Taylor*; Tamson Pietsch, *Empire of Scholars: Universities, Networks and the British Academic World, 1850–1939* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013); Tamson Pietsch, “Imperium et Libertas: G.C. Henderson and Colonial Historical Research at Adelaide,” in *Pasts Present: History at Australia’s Third University*, ed. Wilfrid Prest, 77-85 (Adelaide: Wakefield Press, 2014).

investigate further we need to pinpoint which strands of Australian racial thinking Gates was pulling on.

According to Henry Reynolds there were two faces of White Australia, two regimes for “whitening” the nation. One looked “outward” to exclude the threat of Asia, and stop Asian migrants from gaining access and a corrupting proximity to white female bodies. The other “whitening” project constituted a contradictory “inward” urge, centred round addressing the inconvenient reality that White Australia had never been entirely “white” in the first place.³⁴ Fitting into Reynolds paradigm, Gates was drawn to the inward urge, and the significant persistence of “mixed race” populations within Australia. Gates particular interests revolved around the “hybridity” question, measuring the physical impact of “race mixture” on populations using biometrics, underpinned by a belief that interracial offspring did not have blended characteristics, but retained segregate physical markers from their parent’s racial groups. Which institutions were asking these questions, and with which of them did Gates align?

As Ross Jones has argued, The University of Melbourne Medical School and Department of Anatomy were more focused on eugenics, “racial hygiene” and the medical fortification of white bodies.³⁵ According to Grant McBurnie, Richard Berry, Professor of Anatomy at Melbourne from 1903 to 1929 was a main proponent of this. Berry particularly focused on sterilisation of the “feeble minded.”³⁶

In his more recent work on Australian eugenics after the 1950s, Ross Jones argues that the fizzling out of the Eugenics Society of Victoria by 1961 is deceptive. Instead, he suggested that like other eugenics societies, sympathisers with scientific racism decided to operate more clandestinely, “influencing scientific and social research in a eugenic direction, particularly in the development of the science of genetics and, more broadly, in demographics and population policy.”³⁷ Another important process in the rebirth of not only American and European, but also Australia’s racist eugenic traditions Jones argues, was the launch of the *Mankind Quarterly* in 1961. Gates and Stanley Porteus’ “race crossing” fieldwork in Australia, and the racist political conclusions they drew, mutually reinforced the opinions of others

³⁴ Henry Reynolds, *Nowhere People* (Melbourne: Penguin, 2005); Henry Reynolds, *Frontier: Aborigines, Settlers, and Land* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1987); Henry Reynolds, *North of Capricorn: The Untold Story of Australia’s North* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 2003).

³⁵ Ross L. Jones, *Humanity’s Mirror: 150 Years of Anatomy in Melbourne* (Melbourne: Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology, University of Melbourne, 2007).

³⁶ Grant McBurnie, “Constructing Sexuality in Victoria 1930–1950: Sex Reformers Associated with the Victorian Eugenics Society” (PhD diss., Monash University, 1989).

³⁷ Ross L. Jones, “Eugenics, the 1950s and Beyond,” 288.

who had not accepted de-segregation.³⁸ As Patrick Wolfe and Warwick Anderson have shown, race scientists at the University of Sydney in the 1920s followed an outward urge to investigate “proliferating hybridities” in populations throughout Oceania.³⁹ Investigators such as A.P. Elkin, Stephen Roberts and Harvard anthropologist E.A. Hooton came back with a more positive picture of “race mixture” and “race formation” from intermarriage of Europeans with groups of Pacific Islanders and East Asians, producing healthy “hybrid” populations that they argued existed in relative harmony.⁴⁰

Thirdly, as Zogbaum, Ellinghaus and Stephenson have examined, a debate developed in the 1920s to 1940s between the University of Adelaide, South Australian Museum, and “Aboriginal Protector” officials in charge of policing native populations. They discussed whether “Aboriginals” should be separated from, or intermarried with White Australians.⁴¹ Herbert Basedow among others posited the theory of “aboriginal absorption”, that aboriginals had “Dark Caucasian” genes. Australia could be “whitened” in his view through selective intermarriage between “Dark Caucasians” and “European Caucasians.”

As Ellinghaus has noted, this controversial research helped re-orient White Australian racial thought from a fear of “race mixture” in 1901 to the institution of “even more comprehensive regimes of miscegenation” often overseen by Aboriginal Protector officials such as Cecil Cook and A.O. Neville.⁴² In the 1920s and 1930s the Adelaide School developed a provincialised conception of “racial plasticity” unique to South Australia, and a reading of Lamarckism, that adaption to Australia’s climates would make different racial groups converge over time.⁴³ However Peta Stephenson adds that by the 1940s, “proliferating hybridities,” the place of Asia-Pacific people within Adelaide frameworks of anthropometry and “absorption” were creating contradictions that undermined the movement.⁴⁴ Anderson also proved that the 1938 Harvard-Adelaide “race crossing” study

³⁸ Ibid., on 295.

³⁹ Warwick Anderson, “Ambiguities of Race: Science on the Reproductive Frontier of Australia and the Pacific Between the Wars,” *Australian Historical Studies* 40, no. 2 (2009): 143–60; Patrick Wolfe, “Land, Labor, and Difference: Elementary Structures of Race,” *American Historical Review* 106, no. 3 (2001): 866–905.

⁴⁰ Warwick Anderson, “Ambiguities of Race,” 143.

⁴¹ Heidi Zogbaum, *Changing Skin Colour in Australia: Herbert Basedow and the Black Caucasian* (Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing, 2010); Katherine Ellinghaus, *Taking Assimilation to Heart: Marriages of White Women and Indigenous Men in Australia and the United States, 1887–1937* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2006); Peta Stephenson, *The Outsiders Within: Telling Australia’s Indigenous-Asian Story* (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2007), 74

⁴² Katherine Ellinghaus, *Taking Assimilation to Heart: Marriages of White Women and Indigenous Men in Australia and the United States, 1887–1937* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2006).

⁴³ Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia* (New York: Basic, 2003), 227.

⁴⁴ Peta Stephenson, *The Outsiders Within: Telling Australia’s Indigenous-Asian Story* (Sydney: University of

confounded and divided the anthropologists involved. They began to question the reality or usefulness of rigidly classifying aboriginals and Asians, and marking all “half-caste” as degenerate threat to White Australia.⁴⁵

The article will use this historiography of the rise and fall of the Adelaide School as a jumping off point. Gates in 1958 used the University of Adelaide and their Department of Anatomy as his initial operating base in Australia, and used the advice of those who had conducted the Harvard-Adelaide study to begin his fieldwork. The article will argue that Gates bought into the old Adelaide model of assimilationism, that the aboriginal was a “dark Caucasian” that could produce stable offspring if bred with Europeans. He also felt he could continue where Harvard-Adelaide anthropologists had left off in 1938. He was intent on proving that if aboriginals or Europeans bred with pacific and Sino-Japanese peoples in Australia, they inherited physical features that did not blend harmoniously but were kept segregate, and that this degraded rather than improved human stock.

Gates also sought to hijack what Germann characterised as the “booming field of human genetics” in the 1950s, which he argued could only be understood using the “theory and practise of quantitative inheritance” through physical anthropology and racialised ideas of human difference, rather than studies of DNA.⁴⁶ As Comfort and Lindee have argued, the rise of cytogenetics and molecular genetics to study human heredity by examining chromosomes and genes, were quite marginal disciplines until the end of the 1950s and 1960s respectively.⁴⁷ Genetics was still a very “heterogeneous” field, and with such uncertainty about what the future relationship between the science of heredity and race might look like, Gates certainly believed that his fieldwork and networks throughout Australia and the global south could carve his anthropometric approach of racial genetics a niche in a discourse he still felt was up for negotiation. He and his scientific racist peers at the *Mankind Quarterly* could then try and influence from the margins the political and scientific direction that the study of heredity might take in the late 1950s and early 1960s. The movement could use anthropometric research on intermarriage between pacific peoples and European colonists in the global south to help intellectually buttress racist agendas against interracial marriage in the northern hemisphere. Gates used his Australian research to fill the pages of the *Mankind Quarterly* and other racist journals.

New South Wales Press, 2007), 74.

⁴⁵ Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness*, 227.

⁴⁶ Pascal Germann, “Race in Post-War Science,” 3.

⁴⁷ Nathaniel C. Comfort, *The Science of Human Perfection: How Genes Became the Heart of American Medicine* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012); Susan Lindee, *Moments of Truth in Genetic Medicine* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005).

Callipers, Contacts and Controversies: American Funding and Australian Fieldwork, 1958

Gates set sail in spring 1958 from Montreal for Australia for a sweeping tour of anthropological fieldwork across the country's interior, coastal north and on to Papua New Guinea.⁴⁸ *The West Australian* noted Gates arrival on the liner *Himalaya* for a three month stay. After this trip, accompanied by his wife Laura Greer, Gates returned in the autumn to the Peabody Department of Anthropology, Massachusetts. There he codified his Australian research and published several articles continuing to espouse his doctrine of "racial genetics." Not content to sit still, in 1959, he and Laura embarked on another research and lecture tour encompassing Japan, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Singapore and India.⁴⁹

Gates had been a segregationist throughout his later career and in the late 1950s was keen to interact with those opposed to racial equality who attached political value to pro-segregation research.⁵⁰ His work in Australia was one theatre in a wider international campaign. His studies of the people he observed in Australia and Papua New Guinea, a plethora of Aboriginal, South East Asian and European peoples who had intermarried over centuries, aside from sating his intellectual curiosities, were to be used as ammunition in a scientific-cultural war to prove that interracial marriage would leave an indelible and often negative mark on the populations it touched.

Gates was one of a number of intellectuals internationally, determined to resist the "anti-race" campaign codified by UNESCO in 1950 and 1951.⁵¹ Francesco Cassata argues that the "scientific" nature of UNESCO meant that those fighting its rulings, a constellation of racists, pro-segregation interests and scientific racists could also "camouflage" themselves through appeals to scientific legitimacy.⁵²

Wycliffe Drapers Pioneer Fund, set up in 1937, was secretly behind much of this insurgent activity. Gates took money from Draper in 1954 for a fieldwork trip to Japan in return for a favour. He enlisted Gates to make enquiries about departmental attitudes towards racial anthropology in English speaking universities such as McGill (Canada). Draper was gauging how many scientists and institutions could be persuaded to endorse or conduct research which came to white supremacist, pro-segregation conclusions.⁵³

⁴⁸ *McGill News* (Montreal), 3 October 1958.

⁴⁹ *Atlantic Advocate*, November 1960, 92.

⁵⁰ Gavin Schaffer, *Racial Science and British Society*, 142.

⁵¹ Gil-Riaño, "Relocating Anti-Racist Science."

⁵² Cassata, *Building the New Man*.

⁵³ Wycliffe Draper to Reginald Ruggles Gates, 2 November 1954, and Reginald Ruggles Gates to Wycliffe Draper, 9 November 1954, Gates MSS, K/PP65-7/22/1.

The period before the launch of the *Mankind Quarterly* (1961) gives us a snapshot of a restless Reginald, impatient to continue with fieldwork and promoting “racial genetics.” Without the cheques in the post from benefactors big and small, it is unlikely that, locked out of the coffers and research funds of the larger universities, Gates would have had the resources to be particularly active outside the United States. His letters attest that he was able to gain funding and support through his ability in correspondence to tailor his “race crossing” research, to the parochial anti-integration interests of American racists. The New Orleans “pro-segregation businessman” Edward Benjamin partly funded Gates’ travel to and fieldwork in Australia.⁵⁴ He had written an article, *What It’s All About* (1957) in which he claimed that “desegregation” in the United States was doomed to failure because “whites” had a natural “psycho-physical” antipathy to the “negro.” Having read Benjamin’s typescript, Gates responded approvingly on 9 January 1958. Eventually Benjamin agreed to provide some funds towards Gates trip to Australia with the caveat that Gates continued publishing research supporting the need for “black-white” segregation in the United States.

C. M. Goethe of the Crocker-Anglo Bank in Sacramento also funded Gates. Goethe and his wife helped finance the Eugenics Society of Northern California and launched *Human Genetics Magazine*.⁵⁵ They advocated strict population control policy, arguing that “morons always breed like rabbits”. Goethe wanted compulsory family planning centres and eugenic “indexing” of all American citizens. On 29 January 1958, Goethe enclosed one of many cheques for Gates for his Australian expedition, suggesting he would be able to offer more funds in future, and was “thrilled” that Gates intended to extend his “race crossing” work to Papua New Guinea and Australia.⁵⁶

There were setbacks and rebuttals however, which Gates had often blamed on Jewish conspiracies against him.⁵⁷ Throughout the 1950s Gates pestered Paul Fejos, President of the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, formerly known as the Viking Fund. Fejos replied on 18 September 1958, that “race crossing” research was no longer a particular area of interest for the foundation, denying his request for money.⁵⁸ The Viking Fund had been working to build up an international community of physical anthropologists after the Second World War, and often gave grants to early career anthropologists.⁵⁹ However

⁵⁴ Benjamin to Reginald Ruggles Gates, 14 February, 1958, Gates MSS, Box 1/19; cited in Schaffer, “‘Scientific’ Racism Again?,” 208.

⁵⁵ Goethe to Reginald Ruggles Gates, 16 March 1958, Gates MSS.

⁵⁶ Goethe to Reginald Ruggles Gates, 16 March 1958, Gates MSS.

⁵⁷ R. A. Brimble to Reginald Ruggles Gates, 15 April 1949, Gates MSS, Box 1/12, regarding a rejected article in *Nature*; cited in Schaffer, “‘Scientific’ Racism Again?,” 254.

⁵⁸ Paul Fejos to Reginald Ruggles Gates, 18 September 1958, Gates MSS.

⁵⁹ Susan Lindee and Joanna Radin, “Patrons of the Human Experience: A History of the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, 1941–2016,” *Current Anthropology* 57, S 14

even in their eagerness to rehabilitate physical anthropology as a serious discipline, they were still not persuaded by Gates' claims about the ground-breaking usefulness of his work.

Gates arrived in Australia in 1958, stepping into a nation that had still not divorced itself from its beginnings as a "racial" state under the White Australia Policy (1901). He was welcomed in 1958-59 as a popular scientist who would help shed light on Australia's remaining "race" questions. *The West Australian* flatteringly described Gates as a "world expert on genetics and anthropology" who had come to study the Aboriginals and broader processes of "race mixture." The paper spoke approvingly of Gates' consistent view that segregation was for the national good, that, "the answer to world problems was not the interbreeding of all races. He preferred races to have enough self-respect to stay pure."⁶⁰ Support for Gates comments linking "racial purity" with "self-respect" hints at unresolved public tension toward the future prospect of a multi-cultural, "multi-racial" population.

This obviously was not the full story of 1950s racial discourse. Post-war Australia was a kaleidoscope of contradictory and competing attitudes to immigration, anthropology and skin colour. According to David Walker, Australian ministers and writers from the 1930s onwards increasingly understood that cultural and political rapprochement with Asia would be crucial as Asia-Pacific powers grew in influence. In the 1930s, as Asian nationalisms became increasingly assertive, biologists and anthropologists also, "began to undermine the central concepts of racial thought which had dominated European thought for the last decades."⁶¹

In the Republic of China, Chiang Kai-Shek called for the Australian government to explain its long-term restrictions on Chinese immigration. These complaints led to the establishment of the Commonwealth Immigration Advisory Council to consider the question. Glenda Tavan argues that Australian officials were put under great political pressure to end Asian exclusion, but as Marilyn Lake notes, any drive towards openness and inclusiveness was confused by the fact that, "Australia had pioneered the vision of a white man's country and was one of the most reluctant to change."⁶²

Former Prime Minister Bill Hughes in 1950 reminisced fondly of his role in defeating the Japanese racial equality clause at the Versailles Peace Conference (1919). His sentiments that white exceptionalism in Australia had to be upheld, chimed with scientists such as Melbourne eugenicist Wilfred Agar. In 1954, at the Australian Institute of Political Science

(2016):S218-S301.

⁶⁰ *The West Australian*, 14 July, 1958.

⁶¹ See, Vijay Prashad, *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World* (New York: New Press, 2007).

⁶² Gwenda Tavan, *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia* (Melbourne: Scribe, 2005), 22, 354.

Summer School, anthropologist Grenfell Price argued that the, “White Australia Policy must remain inviolate.”⁶³ Robert Menzies’ Conservative government had made amendments to immigration policy, abolishing the dictation test for non-whites in 1958, and allowing limited admittance of highly qualified “Asian” workers, for potential naturalisation.⁶⁴ However even as restrictions were relaxed, the government revealingly, “chose not to publicise them for fear of a public backlash.”⁶⁵

Many of Australia’s past racial scientists had given up and moved into other fields. One of the prominent interwar anthropologists, Joseph Birdsell had stepped back from anthropometry after the Harvard-Adelaide study of the late 1930s, moving towards genetics. In his eyes too many ancestries over too many generations had combined to make the “hybrid” body unreadable to physical anthropologists using callipers. Michael White from the University of Melbourne and David Catcheside from the University of Adelaide were part of a movement towards the use of genetics in Australian universities to measure population trends.⁶⁶ Sir Frank E. Macfarlane Burnet, immunologist and director of the Walter and Eliza Hall Institute of Medical Research (Melbourne, 1944-1965), in the *Eugenics Review* (1959), used a genetic approach to re-visit Australian scientific racial discourse, arguing that there were “virtues” to a hybrid Australian population brought about by Asian immigration.⁶⁷

There was one particular Australian outlier, University of Hawaii based but Melbourne born psychologist Stanley Porteus, an intellectual outcast and discredited scientific racist who moved in many of the same circles that Gates did. Porteus is mainly remembered for the maze test. This was an intelligence test that Porteus designed to demonstrate that the “feeble minded” were incapable of “long term planning”.⁶⁸ More alarmingly Porteus used this test throughout his career to claim that low intelligence and deviant social behaviour were “inbred and inherited” with “races” such as “Africans” and “Australian Aboriginals” more prone to such phenomena. He pushed a narrative that miscegenation between white Northern Europeans and these groups would negatively impact the intelligence of the offspring.⁶⁹

⁶³ Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men’s Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 353.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 350.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 353.

⁶⁶ D. A. McCann and P. Batterham, “Australian Genetics: A Brief History,” quoted in Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness*, 238.

⁶⁷ Macfarlane Burnet, Migration and Race Mixture from the Genetic Angle, *The Eugenics Review* 51, no. 2 (1959): 93–97.

⁶⁸ Stannard, “Honoring Racism,” 12.

⁶⁹ Stannard, “Honoring Racism,” 10.

This broad thesis, advanced in his book *Temperament and Race* (1926) where he tested various groups in Hawaii, was even at this time widely ridiculed by reviewers as poor scholarship.⁷⁰ When other psychologists such as his mentor H.H. Goddard abandoned the idea of fixed racial types as the prime cause of mental defectiveness, Porteus stuck stubbornly to his politically regressive belief for the rest of his career, becoming marginalized even earlier than Gates.⁷¹

The reinvigoration of scientific racism in the early 1960s, crowned by the publication of the *Mankind Quarterly*, was therefore a boon to Porteus, who eagerly served on the Executive Committee of the IAAEE and as an associate editor of the *Mankind Quarterly* along with Gates. Editorials in the *Mankind Quarterly* praised the Porteus maze test.⁷² In 1962, three years after Gates, Porteus and colleague A. James Gregor did fieldwork in Australia, administering the maze test along with other qualitative interviews at “Australid” Aboriginal settlements outside Alice Springs. Porteus and Gregor concluded from this spurious collection of data that Aboriginal and non-white intermarriage with the White European population of Australia was undesirable. This research went straight into several pieces in the *Mankind Quarterly*, buttressing this resurgence of Neo-Nazism and segregationism.⁷³ A.P. Elkin, professor of anthropology at the University of Sydney declared the “pure white nation” no longer viable in, *Is White Australia Doomed?* (1947), a thesis he advanced in several lectures covered by the Australian press.⁷⁴ He controversially argued that European Australians had failed to effectively colonise the tropics and deserts of the continent, speculating whether the nation should, “open our doors to an ethnic group more adapted to the conditions. . . shall we turn to southern Europe or to the Orient?”⁷⁵ This also reflected an anxiety that encouraging immigration from Southern Europe, the Balkans and East Asia could stoke inter-ethnic conflict.

As a social anthropologist, Elkin drove a move away from biomedical approaches to hybridity of the 1930s Adelaide school, such as those of J.B. Cleland. As Schaffer has also argued, this resonated with a global turn towards social anthropology.⁷⁶

⁷⁰ Ibid., 10.

⁷¹ Ibid., 11.

⁷² Stannard, “Honoring Racism,” 13.

⁷³ Stanley D. Porteus, “The Will to Live,” *The Mankind Quarterly* 3, no. 1 (July–September 1962): 6–18; Stanley D. Porteus, “Australid ‘Assimilation,’” *The Mankind Quarterly* 4, no. 2 (April 1964): 187–196; Stanley D. Porteus, “Problems of Aboriginal Mentality,” *The Mankind Quarterly* 5, no. 1 (January 1965): 123–130.

⁷⁴ Russell McGregor, *Indifferent Inclusion: Aboriginal People and the Australian Nation* (Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, 2011), 61.

⁷⁵ Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness*, 257

⁷⁶ Gavin Schaffer, “‘Like a Baby with a Box of Matches’: British Scientists and the Concept of ‘Race’ in the Inter-War Period,” *British Journal for the History of Science* 38, no. 3 (2005): 307–324.

Anderson notes that Elkin in the 1940s increasingly argued that “full-blood,” “half-caste,” or any other “mixed-race” Australian Aboriginals continued to adhere to ancient cultural practices and worldviews because of what, “seemed to derive from an education in traditional ways, not from any blood drive.”⁷⁷ It was therefore up to the social anthropologist to be able to deliver the lessons of “civilised culture” thereby shaping social rather than biological integration between European and indigenes, creating Australian democratic citizens. As Anderson notes, Birdsell and Elkin both represented different sides of the growing acceptance of hybridity in post-war Australia. The intermixture of different heritages into the aboriginal populations had created untraceable and “unpredictable” biological specimens according to Birdsell. Elkin’s trajectory cast indigenous culture as enriching rather than opposing the body politic.⁷⁸ Anderson argues that partly due to Elkin’s work, other intellectuals, “began to scoff at fictions of racial and cultural purity or homogeneity” making new projections, “that Australia, biologically and socially, would come to take on a more variegated whiteness-if it remained white at all.”⁷⁹

In an address to the Sydney Labour Club in 1945 Elkin claimed that Australia’s outmoded attitudes to immigration and racial difference, still manifested in the Immigration Restriction Acts, “found its root mainly in fear and jealousy of Chinese in the gold-rush period.”⁸⁰ In 1946 as President of the Australia-India association, Elkin suggested at a speech to the Institute of Political Science summer school in January 1946 that the White Australia policy should be replaced with a system of immigration that allowed limited Chinese and Indian settlement.⁸¹ He was criticised by Davidson, Hayden and Roberts, who accused him of “heresy” against the sound principles of the White Australia, and that his “nauseating” statements could lead to instability and interracial conflict in the country.

The criticism that Elkin received when he talked of the possibility of future Asian migration reveals a continuing uncertainty in the way that organisations, intellectuals and the public envisaged the nations post-war complexion and future ethnic and cultural makeup. Continuing suspicion of the outcome of White-Asian intermarriage played a role in shaping this. There was a public interest in outside expertise in throwing light on these questions. Arend Hagedoorn, a Dutch geneticist on a lecture tour of Australian universities in 1949, was explicit that the White Australia Policy should be maintained, and that Chinese and Europeans would lose their unique genetic “advantages” if they intermarried.⁸²

⁷⁷ Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness*, 249.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 251.

⁷⁹ Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness*, 251.

⁸⁰ *Morning Bulletin*, 5 July, 1945.

⁸¹ *Daily Advertiser*, 30 January, 1946; *The Canberra Times*, 30 January, 1946.

⁸² *Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 May, 1949.

Peta Stephenson argues after 1949, “whiteness” as a category became more “plastic,” an umbrella for a shared European culture, with increasing acceptance of Eastern Europeans, Southern Europeans, rather than a simple post-war drive for more British immigrants.⁸³ Post-war immigration plans saw a complicated transition from measurements of racial to cultural difference. However, this change was not by any means absolute, in the late 1950s those who were not of European descent or citizenship still faced great difficulties in applying for and gaining Australian citizenship, “Europeanness. . . still marked the boundary of respectability.”⁸⁴ The Colombo plan was an attempt at cultural exchange with Asian students, and an attempt to present an image of a colour blind and hospitable nation. Such attempts to demonstrate that Australia was now more tolerant of Asians masked the reality that they were often obstructed from settlement and citizenship.⁸⁵

In 1951-52, when UNESCO’s frontal assault on scientific racism was being digested internationally, the Australian government was still refusing to abide by the 1948 UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, and refused to sign up to any international “declaration against racism” in light of continued practices of removing mixed race children from their parents.⁸⁶ Policies of aboriginal absorption and the biological dissolution of the indigenous population were continued or accelerated, and Asian settlement was still opposed lest it lead to “miscegenation” and the “Asianisation” of what was morphing into a white European rather than a white British nation.

Having said this, the UNESCO statements on race were reported upon in detail in 1952. There was growing public recognition in journalistic debate that scientific assumptions surrounding fixed racial difference and European’s superiority were dissipating. By extension, arguments for maintaining White Australia and decrying intermarriage with Asia-Pacific peoples were increasingly operating on shaky political ground. A *Sydney Morning Herald* report on the UNESCO pamphlet “What is Race?” accepted that, “outside the scientist’s laboratory the word ‘race’ has been misused to justify policies of economic and social discrimination” such as the pernicious Nazi myths of the superiority of the “Aryan” type. Rather the anthropologists and social scientists who had compiled the booklet argued that an “intermingling of genes” between “Negroids,” “Mongoloids” and “Caucasoids” over thousands of years meant that “hybrid” populations were the norm, and that there

⁸³ Peta Stephenson, “Beyond Black and White: Aborigines, Asian-Australians and the National Imaginary” (PhD diss., Faculty of Arts, The Australian Centre, University of Melbourne, 2003), 224.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 121.

⁸⁵ Zogbaum, *Changing Skin Colour in Australia*, 127.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 126.

were no pure races. The article was amenable to the idea that race didn't dictate intelligence and skill levels, thereby validating the opening of Australia to skilled Asian workers.⁸⁷

The *Adelaide Chronicle* published an endorsement of the 1950 UNESCO pamphlet, "A Statement on Race Problems" (1950) in which the panel of scientists concluded that "extensive study yielded no evidence that race mixture produces biologically bad results." This represented a public refutation of "hybrid degeneration," a popular justification for the White Australia Policy.⁸⁸ But Claude Levi-Strauss, who advised on the report, argued that race was not, and should not be seen as a factor in the Australian government's settlement of the tropics.⁸⁹ His comments signalled a move away from "climatic determinism", and the notion that "Mongoloids" were superior tropical colonists to whites, ideas characterising the research of Griffith Taylor.⁹⁰

Dr. J.H Bell at the University of Sydney Department of Anthropology in the *Sydney Morning Herald* (1954) complained about the use of the term "race" on the national census, particularly the description of the Chinese as a race rather than simply a national-cultural group, arguing that the government should abide by UNESCO's call to drop the term in favour of "ethnic groups." Bell also questioned use of the term "half-caste" in the census. Although it specified a "half-caste" as a person with "one parent of the European race," Bell pointed out that the other parent could in fact also be of mixed heritage, and with a varied proliferation of heritage going back often several generations, the fact that complex ancestries could be lumped together under one term made it, "misleading and of little use in sociological and demographic research." In line with Birdsell's conclusions, Bell argued measuring "miscegenation" was a meaningless exercise that only stoked division in post-war Australia.⁹¹

Racial tension was still publicly and politically rife. Arthur Calwell, the Australian immigration minister in 1949 under the Australian Labor Party government of Ben Chifley, had to re-invoke the "populate or perish" rhetoric of the 1920s to justify admittance of groups such as Southern Italians and immigrants from Balkan nations who had previously been viewed with suspicion. He even invoked the spectre of potential Asian invasion to justify this policy, claiming Australia needed a larger European population to defend itself.⁹²

⁸⁷ *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 17 November, 1952, 2.

⁸⁸ *Chronicle* (Adelaide), 3 August, 1950, 26.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 26.

⁹⁰ *Chronicle* (Adelaide), 3 August, 1950, 26..

⁹¹ *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 29 June, 1954, 2.

⁹² Peta Stephenson, *The Outsiders Within: Telling Australia's Indigenous-Asian Story* (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2007), 126.

Australian whiteness had therefore become considerably darker, but black and Asian bodies continued to be excluded.

Calwell refused to allow Australian servicemen who had taken Japanese wives to bring them back to Australia after the Second World War, claiming they would “pollute” Australia, and that memories of Japanese atrocities were too fresh.⁹³ Calwell played upon long term “yellow peril” invasion fears which had resurfaced during the Pacific war. Post-war Australian academia saw an uneasy and faltering transition from “biological to cultural determinism” which gave Gates discursive space in which to operate as he interacted carefully with both social and physical anthropologists.⁹⁴

Professor Griffith Taylor was embroiled in these debates about Asian immigration. On 21 January 1957, he wrote a letter to the *Sydney Morning Herald* commenting on an article about Australian leadership of South East Asia written by a J. A. Burton. Burton was extremely pessimistic about the role of Australia in the region and its lack of military muscle or manpower, coupled with its lack of industriousness. Taylor praised Burton for a “realistic” portrayal of Australian weakness in the face of Asia. “I have stated since 1920. . . I see no likelihood that we shall become a powerful nation. . . our future relations with China will be akin to what obtains in the case of Czecho-Slovakia or Poland and their great neighbour.” This long-term perception about Australia’s geopolitical weakness clearly had a profound influence on Taylor’s intellectual output and his views on race.⁹⁵

Taylor’s views were then published in the *Sydney Morning Herald* on 2 February 1957, but correspondent P.R Stephenson in the same issue rebutted Burton’s view, stating that combined with New Zealand, Australia had an industrious “white” population of twelve million which could effectively resist any Asian invasion. J.E.S Knowles replied that Stephenson’s comments about “indolent” Asians “smacked of “racial prejudice” and concurred with Taylor’s view.⁹⁶ However, C. O’Brien, writing from Sydney, attacked Burton and Taylor for underestimating the power and dynamism of Australia illustrated through schemes such as the Colombo Plan, and accusingly concluded that, “there is nothing worse than an “un-Australian”, be he new or old”, an insult Taylor had faced throughout his long

⁹³ Jenny Gregory, ed., *On the Homefront: Western Australia and World War II* (Perth: University of Western Australia Press, 1996), 186; Philip Charrier, “The Evolution of a Stereotype: The Royal Navy and the Japanese ‘Martial Type,’ 1900–1945,” *War & Society* 19, no. 1 (2001): 23-46; Anne Mellor, “Frankenstein, Racial Science, and the ‘Yellow Peril,’” in *Romantic Science: The Literary Forms of Natural History*, ed. Noah Heringman, 173-196 (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003).

⁹⁴ Peta Stephenson, *The Outsiders Within*, 127.

⁹⁵ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 January, 1957.

⁹⁶ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 2 February, 1957.

career.⁹⁷ It was the idea that praising Asians or highlighting White Australia's weakness was unpatriotic and geo-politically dangerous when coming from a senior academic that reoccurred in criticisms of Taylor even after the Second World War.

As Stephenson and Markus argue, changes in legislation and public attitudes toward Asian immigration did not really gather pace until the early 1960s. In 1964, guidelines dictating that Asian immigrants of mixed heritage had to prove they were “seventy-five percent white European,” with a “European” appearance, were discontinued.⁹⁸ As Stephenson concludes, a less aggressive or anxious view of “the prospect of an Asian-Australian population was slowly occurring” by the mid-1960s, but this was no overnight transition.⁹⁹ However, a lingering if nebulous belief in racial difference still permeated swathes of science and society. Furthermore, with the “aboriginal question” and study of pacific populations still active, some belief in the importance, of measuring population mixing, whether from a social or anthropological standpoint, persisted. This meant that Gates was able to correspond with, and gain detailed assistance from, anthropologists of a variety of different persuasions who would often disagree energetically with each other over the centrality and reality of “race” as a marker of human difference.

From Alice Springs to Port Moresby: Gates' Fieldwork and Outback Wanderings

Gates received a substantial amount of advice, expertise and equipment from race scientists from a variety of disciplines all eager to help. Abbie, Elkin, Macintosh, Tindale and Birdsell were crucial in advising Gates and setting him up with equipment and contacts. Gates initially based himself at the University of Adelaide, one of the focal points for the development of Australian expertise in physical anthropology during the interwar years, and it was through the Department of Anatomy at the university that much of his correspondence was routed.

On 14 January 1958, anatomist Professor Abbie at Adelaide, who would be instrumental in putting Gates in touch with scientific contacts and helping him organise his research, wrote to Gates with arrangements for the ANZAAS Congress which he encouraged him to attend.¹⁰⁰ He also suggested Gates meet with the Aboriginal Protection Board after the conference if he wanted to study more hybrid families after his pre-conference research expeditions. Additionally, Abbie encouraged Gates to write to Dr. Gilbert Archey, Director

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Andrew Markus, *Fear and Hatred: Purifying Australia and California 1850–1901* (Sydney: Hale & Iremonger, 1979), 178.

⁹⁹ Stephenson, *The Outsiders Within*, 143.

¹⁰⁰ A. A. Abbie to Reginald Ruggles Gates, 24 February, 1958, Gates MSS.

of the Auckland Institute and Museum to set up a meeting and discussion of “White-Maori and white Asian crosses.”¹⁰¹ He advised him of the large “mixed race” communities around Adelaide “in all degrees.” When it came to studying “miscegenation” in Darwin and Papua New Guinea, Abbie put Gates in touch with the well-known Sydney anthropologist A. P. Elkin. On 28 January, 1958, Elkin replied to Gates’ letter of 21 January, that he was “only too pleased to help you map out a plan of work...if you so desire.”¹⁰²

Elkin was enthusiastic about Gates’ study of the pigmy tribes of Queensland and Madang, and offered information and advice about where to find “Tasmanoid” tribes on Palm Island near Cairns.¹⁰³ Writing to him later, on 22 August, 1958, Elkin was glad that Gates’ “race crossing” fieldwork in Alice Springs and Darwin had “gone well.” Elkin and N.W.G Macintosh were already working together at this point. As they were exchanging travel plans, and advice with Gates, Elkin was also trying to get Gates on to the ANZAAS conference schedule to deliver a research paper, but regretted that timetabling issues made this problematic.¹⁰⁴ Gates exchanged research materials and skin samples on the “hybrids” of Australia and Papua New Guinea with Macintosh, who utilised University of Sydney laboratory technicians to analyse them. The three men finally met in Sydney in early September 1958.¹⁰⁵

On 22 April 1958, Joseph Birdsell from the Department of Anthropology and Sociology at the University of California, who had conducted the Harvard-Adelaide study, wrote to Gates concerning his questions about “Australian hybrids.”¹⁰⁶ Reminiscing about his experience in 1939, he recommended Cairns, Cooktown and Laura as places where “Chinese hybrids” could be observed. Birdsell’s reference to the Chinese “hybrids” in Laura offered Gates the opportunity to investigate the pre-1901 roots of the Chinese settler population, the gold miners who had migrated after the 1850s gold rushes. But Birdsell suggested that observing these Chinese-Australian families was getting increasingly difficult lamenting that, “I found the hybrid families totally unapproachable at the later time. . . due to their having become economically assimilated during the intervening decade and a half.”¹⁰⁷ Australians with some visible non-European ancestry clearly increasingly resented being treated as test subjects rather than democratic citizens, although this seems to have escaped both Birdsell and Gates.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² A. P. Elkin to Reginald Ruggles Gates, 28 January, 1958, Gates MSS.

¹⁰³ A. P. Elkin to Reginald Ruggles Gates, 22 August, 1958, Gates MSS.

¹⁰⁴ A. P. Elkin to Reginald Ruggles Gates, 22 August, 1958, Gates MSS.

¹⁰⁵ N. W. Macintosh to Reginald Ruggles Gates, 27 February, 1959, Gates MSS.

¹⁰⁶ Joseph Birdsell to Reginald Ruggles Gates, 22 April, 1958, Gates MSS.

¹⁰⁷ Joseph Birdsell to Reginald Ruggles Gates, 22 April, 1958, Gates MSS.

Norman Tindale had conducted the Harvard-Adelaide study with Birdsell, but where Birdsell had been convinced by the results to move into the study of genetics, Tindale held to physical anthropology. Still at the South Australian Museum, where he had been researching since the 1930s, Tindale wrote warmly to Gates on 1 May 1958 that he looked forward to meeting him at the ANZAAS congress. Seeing a kindred outback anthropologist, Tindale was, “only too pleased to help you (Gates) with any information regarding the aboriginal hybrids.”¹⁰⁸ Tindale advised that South Australia would be a rich source of data for Gates’ research, with many “hybrid peoples. . . at Point Pearce and Point McLeay” near Adelaide, with some of the families in the, “fourth and fifth generation of crossing.” He even allowed Gates to use six of the ethnographic photographs from his and Birdsell’s study, and loaned Gates some observation equipment from the South Australian Museum.¹⁰⁹

R. L. Gair of Gair Manufacturing in Melbourne wrote to Gates on 11 April, 1958 to offer him assistance from Pastor Albrecht at the Finke River Mission in Central Australia, and Dr. Donald Thomson, of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Melbourne who had studied and lived with the aboriginals around Cape York Peninsula.¹¹⁰ Gates was still in touch with H. J. Fleure, and the two had a history of friendship despite considerable disagreement on the importance of genetics versus observable traits in the measurement of race crossing.¹¹¹ On 23 May, H. J. Fleure wrote to Gates, discussing exchanges of work. Gates had sent Fleure a paper on “Bantu-Indian” crosses, while Fleure mentioned he was getting a paper published on his research on the Welsh. Perhaps trying to smooth over differences of opinion, Fleure flattered Gates, “your efforts towards genetical anthropology are invaluable would that we knew more about genes.”¹¹² Writing to Gates again on 16 June 1958, Fleure gently disagreed with Gates’ emphasis on physical anthropology rather than genetics for measuring race crossing, but wished him well in his Australia journey. “As you know I’m deeply convinced that genes and their inconsistencies are a better line of biological investigation than the old one of subdividing humanity into big regional blocks of skin colour or hair, important as those are.”¹¹³

On 14 March, 1958, Professor David Sinclair at the University of Western Australia replied to Gates’ letter asking to visit the University and give a lecture on his race crossing work, that unfortunately the only anthropologist they had in their department at that time, Dr. Berndt,

¹⁰⁸ Norman Tindale to Reginald Ruggles Gates, 1 May, 1958, Gates MSS.

¹⁰⁹ Norman Tindale to Reginald Ruggles Gates, 1 May, 1958, Gates MSS.

¹¹⁰ R. L. Gair to Reginald Ruggles Gates, 11 April, 1958, Gates MSS.

¹¹¹ Tony Kushner, “H. J. Fleure: A Paradigm for Inter-War Race Thinking in Britain,” *Patterns of Prejudice* 42, no. 2 (2008): 151–66.

¹¹² H. J. Fleure to Reginald Ruggles Gates, 23 May, 1958, Gates MSS.

¹¹³ H. J. Fleure to Reginald Ruggles Gates, 16 June, 1958, Gates MSS.

was a social rather than a physical anthropologist. Therefore, a lecture on anthropology would, “command so little support both within the University and outside as to make it not worth your while.”¹¹⁴ Western Australia, against the backdrop of controversies about climate, settlement, the aboriginal population and the presence of Asians in the state, had previously been a site for physical anthropological study in the 1930s. The rebuttal of Gates here reflects that some Australian institutions had definitely changed their emphasis when it came to constructing race by the late 1950s toward social methodologies and away from purely biological ones.

Gates embarked on an anthropometric research tour of a variety of “hybrid” families, beginning in Alice Springs before travelling to Darwin, and then to Port Moresby and Mount Madang in Papua New Guinea. He published this research as “Studies in Race Crossing. Crosses of Australians and Papuans with Caucasians, Chinese, and the Other Races,” in his friend Luigi Gedda’s journal, *Acta Geneticae medicae et Gemellologiae*. Linking his approach to that of Gedda, Gates noted he felt that he had progressively refined his challenge to mainstream genetics over the past decade. Speaking initially in broad strokes, he claimed he had found some evidence that Asian intermarriage had left a visible mark that could be seen in the cephalic indices of Australia’s “hybrid peoples,” and that, “racial crosses in which Chinese men are involved show the remarkably strong inheritance of the Mongolian brachycephaly” (shorter head).¹¹⁵ Discussing crosses between Papuans and Caucasians, Gates stated that “Papuan skin colour genetics is similar to that of the Australian aborigines.” Furthermore the “Caucasian-Papuan cross F1 hybrid” was “surprisingly like the Caucasian type in many respects.”

Having begun his case studies and anthropometric analyses around Alice Springs, it was then onwards 1000 miles from Alice Springs to Darwin, which took a three-day bus ride. At Port Darwin, Gates stated with fascination that a school he observed there “contained many children of mixed parentage involving a number of racial types.”¹¹⁶ Pacific and East Asian ancestries featured heavily in the seven families Gates studied around Darwin. In family one, according to Gates, the mother was a thirty-nine-year-old (I11.I) “aborigineXwhite”, and the husband of an ancestry that contained, “equal measures of aborigines and Chinese, being heterozygous for all the aboriginal and all the Chinese racial characters.”¹¹⁷ Their seven children displayed the “ingredients” of four “races,” with mixed Filipino,

¹¹⁴ David Sinclair to Reginald Ruggles Gates, 14 March 1958, Gates MSS.

¹¹⁵ Reginald Ruggles Gates, “Studies in Race Crossing: Crosses of Australians and Papuans with Caucasians, Chinese, and Other Races,” *Acta Geneticae Medicae et Gemellologiae* 9, no. 2 (April 1960): 165–84, 166.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 167.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 168.

Malay, Spanish and Chinese heritage. The second son had a “broader face combined with high brachycephaly derived from his Chinese grandfather.” The eldest daughter had a “top eyefold” inherited from a Chinese grandfather, Gates surmised. In analysing the group, Gates claimed that, “each of these children is a mosaic of racial characters derived from white, aborigines or Chinese,”¹¹⁸ The Filipino ancestry was less important to Gates’ anthropometric judgements as they were in his view a “secondary race derived from Malay, Chinese and other elements” and so could “hardly enter into this analysis.” So according to his observations, Chinese ancestry had left a very visible mark on Australia’s post-war population. In family two, the father was “three-quarters Chinese and one quarter aboriginal” and the mother was “AboriginalXWhite.” Their son, Gates inspected, “lost many of the features of the Chinese father apart from being slightly brachycephalic.”¹¹⁹ Gates suggested Chinese characteristics were slightly more recessive in crosses with aborigines, and not a threat to the overall physical “harmony” of offspring.¹²⁰

Highest in the hierarchy of harmony was family five. The father was European ancestry and the mother Japanese. Two sons had “light brown, straight hair and yellowish skin colour. Both were brachycephalic. . . the girl had brown straight hair and practically white skin, with pretty features.” The sons had inherited an “absence of brow ridges” from the Japanese mother. Gates concluded that the genetic characters of the “white” father were dominant over the characters of the mother, but also that “White-Japanese” crossing produced a relatively stable “hybrid.”¹²¹

Gates’ overarching conclusion was that the “Mongolian” brachycephaly was very visible in the “Mongolian crosses,” but other characteristics such as the eye folds less so down the generations of intermarriage.¹²² He boasted it was “surprising” few anthropologists had copied his approach up to now.¹²³ We can see Gates’ ambitions in that he wanted to extend his fieldwork to, “all the races of mankind which are sufficiently in contrast to produce hybrids.”¹²⁴ He wanted to privilege fieldwork over the tiresome debates over social scientific constructions he felt had dragged him down in Anglo-American institutions.¹²⁵ Even Gates

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 168.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 170.

¹²⁰ Ibid., 172.

¹²¹ Gates, “Studies in Race Crossing,” 173.

¹²² Gates, “Studies in Race Crossing,” 175. “In crosses with a Chinese or Japanese ancestor, as in family 1 and 5, the top eye fold generally appears but the epicanthic fold is seldom seen. . . Massed statistics of racial crosses is of little value either to genetics or anthropology. The only way in which a real analysis of racial characters can be made is by a careful and intensive study of individual pedigrees where the original ancestors belonged to different races.”

¹²³ Ibid., 184.

¹²⁴ Ibid., 185.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 184.

admitted that the plethora of diversities he encountered made racial definitions difficult. But he still claimed his brand of racial genetics was effective in unravelling the ancestry of “crosses.” On 8 October 1959, he reiterated these views, in a lecture on “genetical studies” of the Australian aborigines at the Royal Anthropological Institute in London.¹²⁶

In “The Australian Aborigines in a New Setting” for the *Mankind Quarterly* (1960), Gates stated that the physical characteristics of the indigenous people he measured proved that they had a nearer evolutionary affinity with the “Caucasoid race” than “formerly supposed.”¹²⁷ Such ideas had precedent in Australia. Figures such as Herbert Basedow had already toyed with the thesis of “Aboriginal-Caucasian” similarity meaning that interbreeding was acceptable.¹²⁸ Although casting this as a fresh analysis, Gates was merely reiterating the conclusions that the Adelaide School of anthropologists had made in the 1930s, suggesting a degree of intellectual disconnection on his part. Such work acts as more of a personal commentary on Gates’ revelations regarding a “racial group” that he had long wished to study.

However, he also traced some more unique conclusions. Notwithstanding his engagement with Birdsell’s ideas that a number of different Aboriginal “types” inhabited different parts of Australia, he argued that some Australian aborigines he observed were related to the Ainu aboriginal people of Hokkaido, Japan. The Ainu were a “Caucasoid outpost with long head. . . hairy body, and heavy brow ridges” that mirrored the native Australians.¹²⁹ Both races were “archaic Caucasoids” being absorbed into wider populations and national stocks, yet still displaying markers of their ancestry, especially in the Japanese “hybrid.” Millennia of interbreeding with the Ainu had turned significant parts of the Japanese population into a Caucasian-Mongolian cross, which Gates’ analyses claimed had produced a racial hybrid that had created an advanced civilisation he approved of.¹³⁰ Harking back to his archaeological interests in Japan in 1954, Gates felt it was “probable that excavations in the Amur valley in China would throw further light on their origin and later history” of the Ainu aboriginal.

¹²⁶ Reginald Ruggles Gates, “Genetical Studies of the Australian Aborigines,” lecture delivered to the Royal Anthropological Institute, London, 8 October 1959, K/PP65/9/3, Gates MSS. A similar paper was presented on 2 November, 1959 at the Chandra Bose Institute Endowment Lecture.

¹²⁷ Reginald Ruggles Gates, typescript draft article, “The Australian Aborigines in a New Setting,” prepared for *Man*, 1960, 11, Box 4/89/2, Gates MSS. See also Gates, “Studies in Race Crossing,” 2.

¹²⁸ Zogbaum, *Changing Skin Colour in Australia*, 127.

¹²⁹ Ruggles Gates, “The Emergence of Racial Genetics,” 11-14.

¹³⁰ Diary, sketches, and notes of Gates’s travels, interviews, and anthropological investigations in Japan, 1954, including reference to “special one to the Emperor, and a public lecture in Tokyo to an audience of 1200,” Box 2/5, Gates MSS.

Obsessed with the idea of black inferiority, Gates was more positive in his views about the ability of aboriginals to be biologically assimilated more harmoniously into European populations than other racial groups, because of what he argued was their “archaic Caucasian” ancestry. This connected Gates to the Australian scholarship on “aboriginal absorption”, while at the same time reinforcing the hierarchy of harmony in racial relationships he had constructed, placing Australian aboriginals, Ainu aboriginals and East Asians as more stable partners than “Negroids.” These conclusions served both his local and global white supremacist and segregationist interests.

Conclusion

As “Ruggles” Gates died in 1962, the White Australia Policy had still not been fully dismantled. Racially motivated policies such as the forced removal of Aboriginal children from their families persisted. In 1973 the Australian Labor Party supposedly “buried” the White Australia Policy and formally moved towards a policy of multi-culturalism. Australia was not as anti-miscegenationist as post-war South Africa, which became even more extreme in its formalisation of racial segregation through the Mixed Marriage Act (1949) and the Immorality Act (1950) which forbade any kind of interracial sexual liaison.¹³¹ But there was still an uneasy, ambiguous political and intellectual atmosphere, and the transition towards 1973 and afterward was patchy and slow. While not wanting to be ostracised internationally like South Africa, Australian public attitudes to Asian migrants and an Aboriginal-Eurasian future were not entirely harmonious. Stanley Porteus, a known intellectual pariah and scientific racist, was conducting psychological research and racial profiling of Aboriginal and mixed heritage Australians with relative impunity, feeding a glut of articles in the *Mankind Quarterly* for years to come.¹³² It was this ambiguous situation, unfolding against the backdrop of the piecemeal and faltering dismantling of the White Australia Policy that Gates tapped into in 1958. Questions about “hybrid” populations and pacific immigration still stirred immense interest. Elkin, Abbie, Birdsell, Tindale and Macintosh all assisted Gates in carrying out his “race-crossing” work. Elkin didn’t mind at all that Gates was a physical rather than a social anthropologist. There was enough discursive elasticity and shared anthropological interest in mixed race communities and integration policy, whether from a social or anthropometric approach, for different modes of thinking to co-exist in

¹³¹ Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line*, 354.

¹³² Stanley D. Porteus, “The Will to Live,” *The Mankind Quarterly* 3, no. 1 (July–September 1962): 6–18; Stanley D. Porteus, “Australid ‘Assimilation,’” *The Mankind Quarterly* 4, no.2 (April 1964): 187–196; Stanley D. Porteus, “Problems of Aboriginal Mentality,” *The Mankind Quarterly* 5, no.1 (January 1965): 123–130.

plain sight in Australia, in a way that, as Gates knew only too well, had long been impossible in Anglo-American science.

Gates' racism and methodological dogmatism belies his skill as a mobile, manipulative insurgent battling the global decline of racial thinking after the fall of Nazism. Through both persistence and flattery, he courted his American and transatlantic contacts and benefactors. This article has demonstrated that hand in hand with his work making a pseudo-scientific case for segregation and white supremacy in South Africa and the United States through organs such as the *Mankind Quarterly*, Gates was using money and favours to pursue his own more global regressive agenda, and Australia and other areas in the southern hemisphere are underexplored nodes in this agenda. Where Birdsell capitulated, Gates believed to the last he would succeed in proving "racial genetics" as an internationally recognised legitimate approach, part of an attempt to expand an international anti-progressive alliance, striking from the margins, and if possible, hijacking the mainstream discourses of politics and anthropology. Ironically by the 1970s, Birdsell himself was a leading opponent of any kind of racial analysis. However, that had not stopped him and Tindale, perhaps not entirely knowingly, from helping Gates to try and reboot this same racial determinism. This study of Gates' activity in the southern hemisphere therefore problematises narratives of the retreat of scientific racism and complicates histories of both the *Mankind Quarterly* and the Pioneer Fund.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Gavin Schaffer for his thoughts and advice when I was gathering much of the material during my PhD research. I'd also like to thank the staff at the Liddell Hart Archives, Kings College London, for letting me research the Reginald Ruggles Gates papers a number of times.

Competing interests

The author has declared that no competing interests exist.

Funding

The author received no funding for this research.